

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/486,719

Applicant(s)
Boire et al.

Examiner
Deborah Jones

Group Art Unit
1775

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Deborah Jones

(3) Andrew Piziali

(2) Harris A. Pitlick

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 8, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:

All prior art applied.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Counsel urges that the (c) coating layer of claim 16 is not found or suggested in the Hashimoto reference. Counsel urges that the subject matter of claim 39 is not suggested by the applied prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

G. P. 3/8/02